G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1891-92

192 .

(L. R)

File No 138-91

Serial Nos. 1-4.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1-4

In ~~Part~~ B for July 1892.

SUBJECT.

Instructions to Govt Journal and Office Asst that they should not send their Clerks to any talat prior to their proceeding thereon —

Leave granted.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

LR 138-91-1

(General Serial No. 39.)

Received with the above the Jamkhandi Inam Register and the Inam Register of the Jamkhandi Taluka supplemented

No. 91

Name of Petitioner. The inamdar of [illegible]

Village.

Taluk. Kunigal

District. Tumkur

Date of Arzi. 20.1.92

Date of Receipt. 21.1.92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil.

To The Deputy Commissioner

ABSTRACT.

State that they are entitled to the Talari office and to contribute towards the amount to be paid to the Jamkhandi office, and pray that the office may be transferred.

Submitted to the Chief Secretary

23/1/92

2

917

21 - 6 - 12

4 108

LR 138-91-2

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 91
dated 20th June/92 received at the
Dewan's Office from the inhabitants
of Kunigal Taluk, praying
for the transfer of the
Offices of Kunigal Taluk

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~
enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District, for disposal
2 The Deputy Commissioner
will report the date on which
the Jeevanabandy Officer Taluk
Chikkanayakanahalli will be the Taluk
and the date on which the
Jeevanabandy Officer himself
followed.
2 The petition should be returned

By Order,

Draft Telegram 29/6

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
30 June 1892

Engrossed

5

5.

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE
363.
1892
18 JUL. 92
DEWAN OF MYSORE

From The Superintendent of Police
Kolar District

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Government~~ of Mysore

Dated 13th July 1892

Despatched —— 1892

Received 18th July 1892

Enclosures No. 1

General No. 138

P. No.

Subject: Reporting on petition received with his Cover dated 8th July 1892 from Sheikh Ahmed Accountant employed by the Bangalore Municipal Council accusing Mr. Hughes of having taken money from the petitioner

Sir,

In returning herewith the petition received with your Cover cited, I have the honor to report that the petitioner was employed by the Municipality as Municipal Accountant on a salary of Rs. 50 per mensem, and was dismissed from the service on the 30th June 1892 for misconduct in connection with the Municipal accounts. He has been in the habit of coming to me frequently with petitions against Mr. Hughes, the Municipal Commissioner, and I have always declined to receive them, as I considered that the proper course for him to adopt was to submit them to the Municipal Commissioner himself. Mr. Hughes has also informed me that the petitioner has been in the habit of coming to him frequently with petitions against me, and that he has declined to receive them, and has advised him to submit them to me. I have, therefore, no doubt that the petitioner has been trying to get up a case against Mr. Hughes and myself, in order to revenge himself on us for having dismissed him from the service.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Sd.) [illegible]
Superintendent of Police,
Kolar District.

18/7/92

(Sd.) [illegible]
Chief Secretary.

The petition was sent for Mr. Hughes's report

Mr. Hughes's report may be recorded & returned to Chief Secy

21
15/7/92

(Sd.) [illegible]
Dy. Secretary (Ex)

The petitioner's statement preceded the January Spencer Case by a few days. The Petitioner's statement is not a solitary instance of the kind. Others have come to the notice of the Police in the course of inquiries in which they have had occasion to examine the petitioner, and he has always left the impression on their minds that he was actuated by malice.

(Sd.) [illegible]
Asst. Superintendent of Police

Rep. Dr. Hughes 18/7.

Draft order
(Suspension)
[illegible]

No 129
Encl 1

6

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Cawnpore District
Dated 11th July, 892.

To,

The Civil Secretary to the
Government of Agra.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your official Memo No. 98 of the 30th June 892 forwarding for report an anonymous petition complaining that the Accountant of the District Office who has been sent to Etawah by the Examining Officer to check the accounts exists many frauds in the Chandpur and in reply I submit my report.

2. It is stated in the petition that there is much negligence for months in Etawah. This cannot be true, for three Peons would have been sent and all of them could not simply go and return.

3. It is alleged that the Chandpur complainant is the ancestral tenant of the entire village but the District Office Accountant that he has no title to it but holds merely as tenant according to Circular. The Tahsildar (Mr. Brijnandan Lal) says that no such complaint was made to him and that as Local Officer he can say that there is no ground to suspect any misconduct of the kind referred to. He also says that the Chandpur petitioner to him personally and that the statements contained in the petition are false.

4. It would appear that the Accountant was sent to Etawah on the 4th June 892.

and

ainsi que le jugement précédemment rendu
en la 2e Chambre. N°2. Et annulé dans
leurs dispositions ci-après ——— pièces
dont lecture a été donnée. Et
dans celle ci-dessus relatée aux
motifs ci-dessus énoncés;
5. Sur la position de Salaire Extraordinaire.

Chambre des Comptes,

Sir,

Journal des Débats Commerciaux

Le Secrétaire

Député Commissaire.

Read '89 8.

(To be printed in evidence)

Letter 18 Dec 1889
from the Sy: Comm: Tonbridge
&c.

Lo 138-91-4

—a—

Order thereon

In this case the Jamaica officer stated in his report, sent to me 12 days before the Jamaica officer went there himself, and the Trinidad village officials had apparently to wait on the latter as well as on the Jamaica officer himself. There was no necessity for the establishment thus preceding the Jamaica officer, and the Govt agree with the Sy: Comm: in thinking that it would have been better if the Jamaica officer had taken his accounts with him. The objectionable practice must be

(Grandy true)

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Sy: Commr: Furniture &c
" Commr: for Inam &c

Dated 21
Despatched 26 } July/96.
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. ~~1796~~ 1796-13
P. F. No. 57-22-3

Requesting that the Jamabandy opium Establishment may not be sent to any Taluk prior to the Jamabandy opium proceedings there.

References to be marked.

10

10.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, (Petition),—dated 21st July 1892.

READ :—

Letter No. 138, dated 10th July 1892, from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

No. 1206-13—P. F. 87, DATED 21ST JULY 1892.

ORDER THEREON.—In this case the Jamabandi Officer's Establishment was sent to the Taluk 12 days before the Jamabandi Officer went there himself, and the Taluk and village officials had apparently thus to wait on the establishment as well as on the Jamabandi Officer himself for a long time. There was no necessity for the establishment thus preceding the Jamabandi Officer, and the Government agree with the Deputy Commissioner in thinking that it would have been better if the Jamabandi Officer had taken his Accountants with him. The objectionable practice must be put a stop to.

Chief Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District.
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts.

Exd.—B.G.B.

1892.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

PETITION.

PROCEEDINGS.

Dated 21*st July* 1892.

No. 1206-13.
P. F. 87.

Ordering that the Jamabandi Officer's Establishment must not be sent to any Taluk prior to the Jamabandi Officer proceeding there.

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—29-7-92.—120.